



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III.—A PRE-VARRONIAN CHAPTER OF ROMAN LITERARY HISTORY.

The pre-eminence of Varro among the scholarly figures of Roman antiquity has undoubtedly led to an exaggerated estimate of the value of his methods and the significance of his results. But while the ever-advancing investigation of Roman literature reveals the hand of Varro in methods which are foolish and in results which are impossible, on the other hand it discloses equally his enormous superiority to the school of philological and antiquarian studies which he supplanted and out of which he came. This very pre-eminence has made the task of separating Varronian from pre-Varronian views one of the greatest difficulty; but obviously such a separation is of supreme importance, not only for a just estimate of Varro, but also for a real comprehension of the development of philological studies at Rome, and in the present paper it is my purpose to attempt to distinguish two strata in the history of these studies, which have hitherto been obscurely merged in each other or quite identified.

The beginnings of literary and grammatical studies at Rome are described by Suetonius in the interesting historical introduction to his treatise *De grammaticis*. After explaining that the earliest scholars were poets of foreign birth who only translated Greek writers or gave readings of their own compositions, he goes on to narrate how the first decisive impulse to these studies was derived from the lectures of Crates of Mallus, who came as an ambassador from King Attalus of Pergamon, very soon after the death of Ennius (169 B. C.),<sup>1</sup> *ac nostris fuit exemplo ad imitandum: hactenus tamen imitati, ut carmina parum adhuc divulgata vel defunctorum amicorum vel si quorum aliorum probassent, diligentius retractarent ac legendo commentandoque et ceteris nota facerent*. Thereupon follow several examples of the early editorial activity that was thus inaugurated,

<sup>1</sup>On the inaccurate statement of Suetonius, since the reign of Attalus II (Philadelphus) did not begin until 159 B. C., see Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 29, note 1.

the first of which will suffice for illustration, setting forth how *C. Octavius Lampadio Naevii Punicum bellum, quod uno volumine et continenti scriptura expositum divisit in septem libros*. That this division bears some relation to Crates' division of the Homeric poems is a not improbable conjecture,<sup>1</sup> and it will serve to illustrate the method of the literary study inaugurated by the example of Crates and the character of the 'imitation' of his Roman disciples. Although the words of Suetonius only make specific reference to editorial and interpretative studies (*retractarent, legendo, commentando*), we may confidently assume that the example of Crates afforded stimulus to the beginnings of literary history, aside from the elements of it which are implied in the preparation of the critical edition of antiquity, viz. the literary and historical introduction.<sup>2</sup> For that Crates was the author of a treatise *περὶ κωμῳδίας* at least (whether a separate work or an introduction to his commentary on Aristophanes) is quite certain, and his lectures would naturally have included such subjects as well as technical interpretation and criticism.

But the Romans were as yet still in leading strings in literature, and how far therefore removed from any naturally developed critical spirit, not to say sound method in its application, some of the products of these earlier Roman studies are eloquent witnesses. Perhaps a more childish example is not afforded than the arguments by which Accius demonstrated that Hesiod was older than Homer: *quod Homerus, inquit, cum in principio carminis Achillem esse filium Pelei diceret, quis esset Peleus non addidit; quam rem procul dubio dixisset, nisi ab Hesiodo iam dictum videret*, and a similar argument drawn from the monstrosity of the single-eyed Cyclops follows. Inasmuch as the chapter of Gellius (III 11) which affords us this specimen of the philology of Accius begins and ends with Varro's treatment of the questions concerning the age and the birthplace of Homer, from the first book *De imaginibus*, it is quite certain that here, as elsewhere (III 3, 9: *M. Varro in libro de comoediis Plautinis primo Accii verba haec ponit*), Gellius owes his knowledge of the earlier critic to Varro himself, and that the passage of Accius was cited in the descriptive text of the *Imagines* to be refuted by the documentary

<sup>1</sup> Hillscher, *Hominum litteratorum etc. hist. crit.*, in *Jhbb. für Phil.*, Supplementband XVIII (1892), p. 358, and cf. Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.*, vol. II, p. 10 (note 50).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Wilamowitz, *Herakles* (ed. I), vol. I, p. 144 ff.

evidence which Varro brought to bear upon the point (*ex epigrammate in tripode . . . qui in monte Helicone ab Hesiodo positus traditur*) to show *uter prior sit natus parum constare . . . , sed non esse dubium quin aliquo tempore eodem vixerint*. Another example in which we find Varro citing and correcting the view of Accius we shall have occasion to examine in more detail presently. Equally illustrative of the immaturity of this early criticism is the well-known fact of its extraordinarily imitative character. This was conspicuous not only in external features, such as the adoption of technical terms and the entire acceptance of classifications of all kinds, but also in the reproduction of much which in the nature of things must have been inapplicable as depending upon totally different historical and social conditions. I do not mean to imply that Roman scholars ever entirely abandoned this procedure, and ample illustration of trivial and imitative criticism is afforded by examples that are Varronian and post-Varronian.<sup>1</sup> But Varro in this field as elsewhere corrected what he could, and by appeal to the evidence of the literature itself, and especially by his chronological investigations in the public documents, succeeded in demolishing many received opinions of his day.

One of the most remarkable and extensive examples of the imitative literary history to which I have alluded, I pointed out in an earlier number of this Journal (vol. XV, pp. 1-30), showing that the dramatic *satura* described by Livy (VII 2) was but an

<sup>1</sup> An illustration from late antiquity, to which I believe attention has never been called, may not be out of place here. In the Pseudo-Acronian preface to the scholia on the Sermones of Horace, the author says (Hauthal, II, p. 3): *Satira istius (sc. Horatii) inter Lucilii satiram est et Iuvenalis media, nam et asperitatem habet quam Lucilius, et suavitatem quam Iuvenalis mixtam in suo carmine*. Here the *suavitas Iuvenalis* will cause amusement and perhaps perplexity, if we were not in the habit of dismissing lightly the absurdities of the scholiast without much consideration. But the extraordinary characterization of Juvenal is not without its explanation, for it is only the consistent product—surprising, to be sure—of an unfaltering effort to force Latin writers into a rubric fixed by Greek literary criticism. The second treatise *περί κωμωδίας* attributed to one Platonius (in Dübner's Scholia in Aristoph., no. II, p. xiv) betrays the source, in its concluding words concerning the three great masters of the old comedy: *ὁ δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης τὸν μέσον ἐλήλακε τῶν ἀνδρῶν χαρακτῆρα, οὔτε γὰρ πικρὸς λίαν ἐστὶν ὥσπερ ὁ Κρατῖνος, οὔτε χαρίεις ὥσπερ ὁ Εὐπολῖς, ἀλλ' ἔχει καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀμαρτάνοντας τὸ σφοδρὸν τοῦ Κρατίνου καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐπιτρεχούσης χάριτος Εὐπόλιδος*.

assumed Roman analogue to the old Greek comedy, and that the whole narrative of Livy (and of the related description in Horace, Epp. II 1, 145-160) reproduces essentially and even in detail the Aristotelian sketch of Attic comedy. The difficult but important question of the source of this piece of artificial history I left unanswered, merely calling attention to some of the problems involved in its solution (l. c., p. 30 and note). What I there expressed tentatively and only by way of conjecture, I shall here undertake to prove, viz. that the whole description goes back of Varro to some "one of his less critical predecessors" (ibid.). I shall not urge as ground for my contention "that the assumption is so monstrously unhistorical that one is inclined to doubt whether Varro can have been the author of it" (ibid.)—though this consideration is not without significance—but I shall confine myself rather to concrete arguments, in part of a chronological character. Here, as elsewhere, we shall find an earlier view, the product of literary history in its infancy, set aside by the chronological and documentary investigations of Varro.

That Varro is the common source of Livy and Horace has been and is, so far as I know, the undisputed opinion of a number of very eminent scholars who have considered the question. But none of them has gone further than to affirm that he is the only natural source to assume, and that we cannot well attribute it to another. Jahn, in *Hermes*, vol. II (1867), p. 225, after characterizing the chapter as the "Résumé der Combination eines Grammatikers," says very briefly: "am nächsten liegt es wohl an Varro *De originibus scaenicis* zu denken." Leo in the same journal, vol. XXIV (1889), p. 76, referring to Jahn's identification of the source, says with more confidence: "Man darf wohl behaupten das für Livius eine andere Quelle so wenig wahrscheinlich ist, wie für diese Darstellung ein anderer Ursprung."<sup>1</sup> Few, I imagine, any longer doubt that the chapter is the constructive work of imitative literary history and not the authentic record of facts.<sup>2</sup> But that Varro must be assumed as

<sup>1</sup> So also Kiessling ad Hor. Epp. II 1, 139. But less confidently, Hor. Satiren, p. vii: "Varro oder wer sonst der Gewährsmann von Livius (VII 2) ... ist." Cf. in addition Leo, *Plautinische Forsch.*, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> But cf. Dietrich, *Pulcinella* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 80, note, and Pease, in *Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature*, etc. (New York, 1897), article *Satire*.

its source is not required by any evidence of the chapter itself and is a conclusion no more necessary than would be the assumption that there were no earlier philologists to whom it could be referred. If, therefore, it can be shown that this narrative contains elements which are irreconcilable with the known results of Varro's investigations, and even presents views which he distinctly refuted, we shall be compelled to assign the chapter to a pre-Varronian source, and, as will be seen, we shall not be without a clue to a closer identification.

We have seen above how by appeal to documentary evidence Varro refuted the trivial arguments of Accius concerning the time of Hesiod. Another conspicuous example of the same kind, which goes to the very heart of the question in hand, is preserved for us by Cicero in the *Brutus* (72). There, on the authority of Atticus in his *Liber annalis*, then but recently published, Cicero states: *atqui hic (Livius) primus fabulam C. Claudio et M. Tuditano consulibus docuit anno ipso ante, quam natus est Ennius (= 240 B. C.) . . . ut hic ait quem nos sequimur,—est enim inter scriptores de numero annorum controversia—Accius autem a Q. Maximo quantum consule (209 B. C.) captum Tarento scripsit Livium annis XXX post, quam eum fabulam docuisse et Atticus scribit et nos in antiquis commentariis invenimus; docuisse autem fabulam annis post XI C. Cornelio Q. Minucio consulibus (197 B. C.) ludis Inventatis, quos Salinator Senensi proelio voverat: in quo tantus error Accii fuit, ut his consulibus XL annos natus Ennius fuerit; cui si aequalis fuerit Livius, minor fuit aliquanto is qui primus fabulam dedit, quam ei qui multas docuerant ante hos consules (197 B. C.), et Plautus et Naevius.* The correction of Accius' mistake is not of course due to Atticus, who in this work certainly only aimed to summarize the results of others, but to Varro, as Clinton (*Fasti Hell.*, vol. III, Int. XIX) saw and as Leo has recently pointed out (*Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 58), comparing Gellius, XVII 21, 42, who gives the corrected date for the first production of plays at Rome and states that Ennius was born in the subsequent year on the authority of *M. Varro in primo de poetis libro*. But the error of Accius is not an isolated one, as Leo has very admirably shown (l. c.) by evidence of another example of the same mistake contained in the chapter of Gellius cited: *eodem anno (235 B. C.) C. Naevius poeta fabulas apud populum dedit, quem M. Varro in libro de poetis primo stipendia fecisse ait bello Poenico primo, idque ipsum Naevium*

*dicere in eo carmine quod de eodem bello scripsit.* That Naevius was older than was usually believed, Varro was thus able to prove out of the *Bellum Poenicum* itself, and he adduces this fact in criticism of the view which follows, viz. *Porcius autem Licinus serius poeticam Romae coepisse dicit in his versibus :*

*Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu  
Intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram.*

Leo has made it very clear that these verses do not refer to a new period in Roman poetry inaugurated by Ennius, as is commonly interpreted, but reveal rather that their author was of the opinion that the beginnings of Roman poetry belonged to the period of the second Punic war. But doubters there will be, who will question on the one hand this interpretation of the verses of Porcius, or admitting that they refer to the actual beginnings, will deny that the words *Poenico bello secundo* need bring us so far down as the chronology of Accius requires. To show, therefore, that the blunder of Accius does not stand alone (as seems to be the current opinion), but represents a widely diffused pre-Varronian conception of the early literary chronology, let us see what other evidence can be brought to bear upon the question.

In the first place, while it may be conceivable that the egregious blunder of Accius was an individual one and so conspicuously erroneous as to be without important effect upon his own or subsequent times, and while it may also be conceivable that Varro would have taken pains to refute such an isolated aberration, it is not conceivable that Atticus in a brief historical summary would have devoted his attention to the detailed refutation of such an error. But his mention of it (not dogmatically, but with detailed evidence) is the clearest indication of the radical importance of Varro's correction in demolishing a generally accepted theory of Roman literary chronology. If further proof of this kind is desired we have it in the fact that Cicero takes up the point irrelevantly (*haec si minus apta videntur huic sermoni*, *ibid.* 74), but lured on by the novelty and interest of the disclosures which Atticus' book contained (*v. q. sq. ibid.*). But turning to more concrete evidence, let us examine *De senectute* 50, where Cato, in illustration of the statement *si vero habet aliquod tamquam pabulum studii atque doctrinae, nihil est otiosa senectute iucundius*, enumerates examples from Roman history: (*in studio*

*dimetiendi caeli*) Gallus, (*in levioribus studiis*) quam gaudebat bello suo Punico Naevius, quam Truculento Plautus, quam Pseudolo: vidi etiam senem Livium, qui cum sex annis ante quam ego natus sum fabulam docuisset Centone Tuditanoque consulibus, usque ad adulescentiam meam processit aetate. In this passage the reference to the age of Livius and to the time of the production of his first play is, so far as I know, looked upon merely as one of the didactic digressions in which the Cato Major is rich. And yet, when attention is called to it in connection with the refutation of Accius' error in the Brutus, it will be seen very clearly that the reason for the information given is to justify the designation of Livius as *senex* in the mouth of Cato, and thus to refute a popular error. For if Livius had produced his first play in 197, he would presumably have been a man no older (or even younger) than Cato himself, and still a young man at the end of his career. In order, therefore, to furnish an illustration of Cato's point (*eos omnes quos commemoravi, his studiis flagrantis senes vidimus*, *ibid.*) it was necessary to indicate the true chronological relation of Livius to Cato, and to the other poets mentioned. Thus this digression, which otherwise would seem to furnish purely gratuitous information such as is not attached to any of the other illustrations, finds a complete explanation. Once again Cicero touches on the matter in the Tusc. Disp. I 3, giving the corrected date of Livius and his relation to Ennius, Plautus and Naevius, but elsewhere he does not make mention of him (with the exception of the *Liviani modi* in De leg. II 39, and the *Livianae fabulae* in Brutus 71, out of which the discussion in 72 arises). So we see that his interest in Livius was distinctly subordinated to the chronological novelties which Varro's investigation had attached to his name.

Another witness to a false chronology, similar to, if not identical with, that of Accius, was cited by Madvig, in his *Commentatio de L. Attii didascaliciis*, in 1831 (*Opusc. ed. alt.*, p. 82). We have seen above that Accius believed that the first play of Livius was produced in the year 197 at the *ludi Iuventatis*, given in accordance with the vow of Livius Salinator on his victory at Sena (207). The same event is referred to the year 191 by Livy (XXXVI 36, 5 ff.): *item Iuventatis aedem in circo maximo C. Licinius Lucullus duumvir dedicavit. voverat eam sexdecim annis ante M. Livius consul. . . . huius quoque dedicandae causa ludi facti et omnia cum maiore religione facta, quod novum cum Antiocho instabat bellum*. This description is pre-



ceded by the narrative of the dedication in the same year (191) of the temple of the *magna mater Idaea* (ibid. 4): *Dedicavit eam M. Iunius Brutus, ludique ob dedicationem eius facti, quos primos scaenicos fuisse Antias Valerius est auctor, Megalesia appellatos*. The words obviously "aliam sententiam non habent, nisi hos ludos primos omnino scaenicos fuisse, appellatos autem Megalesia" (Madvig, l. c., and cf. Weissenborn ad loc.). What Livy's attitude toward the statement is we should gladly know, but we do not learn. That the phrase *Antias Valerius auctor est* implies dissent on Livy's part is by no means the case,<sup>1</sup> as Weissenborn here suggests, but on the other hand we need not urge that it implies unqualified acceptance of the statement. In regard to the origin of the error of Valerius Antias there are many possibilities, and Madvig (l. c., note) has presented, with much ingenuity and learning, a plausible (*veri similem, si non veram*) explanation. I should prefer a less intricate hypothesis, and starting with the presumption of Accius' acknowledged authority in matters of dramatic history, it would seem to me most natural to suspect that a divergence of authorities concerning the date of the *ludi Iuventatis* of Salinator was the source of the error. Valerius, let us assume, had it from Accius that the first play of Livius was produced at the *ludi Iuventatis*, but he found these *ludi* in some source transferred to the year 191. Now the Megalesia of this year on the dedication of the temple of the Magna Mater so far eclipsed all previous spectacles of the kind at Rome, that it seemed more reasonable to associate the first *ludi scaenici* with this celebration rather than with the more modest *ludi Iuventatis*. Still "confusio quaedam in tota hac re talis effecta est, ut errorum seriem vix persequi possimus" (Madvig, l. c.). But the essential thing for our present purpose is clear enough, viz. that Valerius Antias presents a chronology of similar incorrectness to that of Accius, and that Livy was not at pains to refute so remarkable an error.

To gather up at this point all the evidence for the diffusion of the chronology of Accius, I add here the entry of St. Jerome against the year 187 B. C.: *Livius tragoediarum scriptor clarus habetur*. The relationship between this statement and the chronology of Accius was pointed out by C. F. Hermann in a Göttingen program of 1848 (p. 3), and, as will be seen, it fits

<sup>1</sup> As examination of Livy's use of the formula *auctor est* (v. Fügner, *Lex. Liv.*, s. v.) will reveal.

admirably. The date 187 is gained not unnaturally by adding ten years to the time of his first play, as in a similar manner the 'floruit' of Caecilius is fixed by going back ten years from the time of his death.

This somewhat protracted review of the literary chronology of Accius has not, I hope, been without independent value as an illustration of one phase of pre-Varronian literary history. Through it, moreover, we have gained a vantage point that was necessary for the proper understanding of a passage that will lead us near our goal in ascertaining the *provenance* of Livy's chapter. That Horace's similar description in the letter to Augustus, vss. 145-160, is derived from the same source as Livy's is, I believe, universally conceded. There, it will be recalled,<sup>1</sup> the progressive development of a native comedy, through the three stages of the (1) *fescennina licentia* (φαλλικά), (2) the *aperta rabies* (προφανὸς σκόπτειν), and (3) the artistic drama designed to please (*delectare*, τέρπειν) and not to abuse (*benedicere* = *non maledicere*, μὴ λυπεῖν) is described, corresponding closely to the Aristotelian outlines of the development of Attic comedy. The description concludes:

- 156 *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis*  
*intulit agresti Latio. Sic horridus ille*  
*defluxit numerus Saturnius et grave virus*  
*munditiae pepulere; sed in longum tamen aevum*  
 160 *manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris.*  
*Serus enim Graecis admovit acumina chartis*  
*et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit,*  
*quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent:*  
*temptavit quoque rem, si digne vertere posset,*  
 165 *et placuit sibi, natura sublimis et acer.*

I have said before, in considering these lines (l. c., p. 25), that it would seem most natural to refer *Graecia capta* to the conquest of Magna Graecia; but in the light of what I have since learned concerning the opinion which prevailed before Varro of the period to which Livius Andronicus belonged, with the consequent advancement of the whole literary chronology of the time by a generation, I now doubt if that interpretation be the natural or correct one. Kiessling says of the pointedly paradoxical words: *Graecia capta . . . victorem cepit*—"a commonplace first uttered

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 288, and my article on 'The Dramatic Satura and the Old Comedy at Rome,' in this Journal, vol. XV (1894), p. 20 ff.

apparently by Cato, and afterward oft repeated, in which Horace is thinking of the introduction of elements of Greek civilization that followed on the subjugation of Magna Graecia." While the words are general, their special application of course is to the introduction of letters, and accordingly the time referred to will depend upon the conception that Horace had of the period to which Livius Andronicus belonged. Thus Kiessling, not doubting that Horace would place his first play in 240 B. C., interprets the words as just quoted, adding: "war doch Livius Andronicus ein kriegsgefangener Grieche" (*captus Graecus*). His conception of the passage and its relation to Livius Andronicus is certainly correct, but he has erred in naming the period referred to in the words *Graecia capta*; for is Horace following the corrected chronology of Varro?

The utterance of Cato, which Horace here adapts to the person of Livius Andronicus as the inaugurator of literary studies at Rome, is preserved for us in the report of the famous speech which he delivered against the abrogation of the *lex Oppia* in 195 B. C.: *eo plus horreo, ne illae magis res nos ceperint quam nos illas. infesta, mihi credite, signa ab Syracusis illata sunt huic urbi* (Livy, XXXIV 4, 4). I have quoted this passage for the sake of comparing with it the comment of Livy on the bringing to Rome of the spoils of Syracuse after its capture in 212 B. C.: *ceterum inde primum initium mirandi Graecarum artium opera* (XXV 40, 2). From these two passages we have clear evidence of the time to which the words of Horace would naturally carry the mind of the Roman reader. That Horace was at liberty to give them another application in point of time is of course true, but we shall see that he saw no occasion for doing so. The origin of the catch-word *Graecia capta . . . cepit* carries us to the period of the end of the second Punic war, and—while recognizing that the words do not allude so much to any specific stage in the subjugation of Greece, as to a period in the growing culture of Rome—the text of Horace refers us to the same time, *post Punica bella*. *Serius* takes up *ferum victorem* again, after the intervening summary (*sic horridus ille ff.*) of the preceding description, and so binds *intulit artes* closely together with *Graecis admovit acumina chartis*. The two expressions are but different aspects of the same thought, and cannot be separated in point of time. *Intulit artes* is a figurative expression (and especially as here used of literature, which is not a commodity that can be imported and stored and drawn upon when

desired), which is interpreted by the words *admovit acumina chartis*. Horace's point of view and form of expression are similar to the verses of Porcius Licinus already cited (*Poenico bello secundo musa pinnato gradu || intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram*).

Turning now to the words which follow :

*et post Punica bella quietus quaerere coepit  
quid Sophocles et Thespis et Aeschylus utile ferrent.  
temptavit quoque rem, si digne vertere posset, etc.*

there is nothing longer to prevent us from interpreting them literally and without putting into them anything more than their face value. What Horace says is that the very beginnings of Roman literature, and specifically of Roman tragedy, fell in the lull that followed the Punic wars, i. e. the second Punic war. He is not therefore thinking of Ennius "als den Begründer der römischen hellenisierenden Dichtung und den ältesten in der Reihe der klassischen Tragiker Roms" (Kiessling), but of the whole group of earliest writers—Livius Andronicus (whom he believed, following Accius and the current chronology in which he had been brought up, to have begun his activity at the end of the second Punic war), Naevius and Ennius, following each other in close succession and nearly contemporary.<sup>1</sup> We may fairly insist that the words denote actual beginnings, for *quaerere coepit* certainly admits of no other natural explanation. That is even a step further back than the beginning, it is the reflection that precedes the undertaking; *temptavit rem*, the earliest essays, before the possibility of accomplishment had been established (*si digne vertere posset*); *placuit sibi* etc., the success with which the first efforts met. That there is any ground for believing that Horace is here referring to Ennius and his time, passing over as unworthy of notice his predecessors in literature, may be emphatically denied. Horace's criticism in this letter and elsewhere is directed against all that the patriotic critics cherished. Accordingly, in verses 50-62 he reviews impartially and shows that the critics cherished (*ut critici dicunt*) impartially all the great poets

<sup>1</sup> It is to refute this view, which was evidently a current one, and to make clear the chronological relations that Cicero in Tusc. I 3 says: *Livius . . . qui fuit maior natu quam Plautus et Naevius*. These words have seemed to Cicero's critics so otiose and needless that modern editors almost without exception have eliminated them as the stupid gloss of a copyist. They are essential to the whole argument.

from Livius to Afranius. If Horace were the friend and advocate of Ennius we might grant that he could fairly assume on the part of his readers acquaintance with the fact that he placed Ennius in a different category and dated the beginnings of Roman poetry from him, ignoring all that went before. But of course that is not the case either here or in the *Ars Poetica* (259 ff.). Ennius is everywhere comprehended in the same criticism with the rest.<sup>1</sup> We must conclude, therefore, that Horace's words can only be referred to the actual beginnings of Roman tragedy. The placing of these after the second Punic war reveals that Horace follows the older Accian chronology, dating the first play of Livius in 197 B. C. Against this conclusion it may be urged that as Horace has elsewhere in this letter (50-62) made obvious reference to Varronian studies, so here we should expect him to follow the corrected chronology of Varro. But Horace is a poet and but little concerned with Varro's chronological inquiries, and it will not seem strange that writing as late as 14 B. C. (Vahlen) he should reproduce a view which had been universally held in his boyhood and which doubtless continued to be the prevailing popular opinion long after it had been refuted by Varro; just as Livy, writing at about the same time,<sup>2</sup> reports without comment or wonder the statement of Valerius Antias, that the first *ludi*

<sup>1</sup> It is probable that there was a school of critics at Rome who looked upon Ennius as the father and source of artistic poetry at Rome, following the arrogant pretensions of Ennius himself, echoed again in Lucretius and in Varro (in citation), *Sat. Menip.* 356, Büch. But the verses of Porcius Licinus are not to be cited in evidence of it, as Leo has very convincingly shown (v. supra, p. 290), and to force Cicero into line with this point of view, as Büttner does (*Porc. Lic.* [Leipz. 1893], p. 50 ff. and p. 62), is only an illustration of the lengths to which special pleading will go. Not to mention Brutus 75 and 76, in which Cicero expressly defends Naevius against the depreciation of Ennius (where Büttner can only express amazement at the inconsistency of Cicero (l. c., p. 68)), Cicero speaks in the warmest praise of his language in *De orat.* III 45 (an interesting and instructive passage), and *Orator* 155 only indicates that hiatus was more frequent in Naevius than in Ennius. From what other passages a judgment of Cicero on Naevius can be derived I do not know. *Sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior (quam Naevius)*, is Cicero's sober verdict (*Brutus* 76), as far removed from ignoring the one as from exalting the other. The patriotic critics of Varro's type in the middle of the first century had lost all such distinctions as the arrogant claims of Ennius may have given rise to, in universal admiration of all the early writers.

<sup>2</sup> If, as is assumed, Livy's history was produced at the rate of from three to four books a year, the thirty-sixth book would fall in the neighborhood of 16-13 B. C.

*scaenici* fell as late as 191. Furthermore, Horace's allusions to Varro's studies in this letter are for the sake of criticising and ridiculing them, and therefore afford no ground for assuming that in the parts of his letter which have nothing to do with the literary judgments of Varro and his school, any attention should be paid to the results of Varronian investigation.

But having found in these verses of Horace clear evidence of pre-Varronian chronology, it is in itself almost conclusive evidence that the preceding account of the development of a native comedy at Rome is also pre-Varronian. For not only is the continuity of narrative unbroken, but it will be possible to show that the false chronology and the whole theory of a native drama before Livius Andronicus are intimately related to each other. In considering this question before, I suggested that in addition to the motive of mere parallelism, there may have been present a certain aetiological element in constructing an ἀρχαία κωμῳδία for the sake of explaining the ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳθεῖν of Naevius. That both of these elements had some influence in determining the character of the literary history thus constructed I still hold, but the decisive impulse I now see came from another source.

Turning again to Accius, the author of the false chronology which Horace reveals, it was possible for him to have known men whose memory went back to the literary figures active in Rome at the end of the third century. How confused and vague was the information concerning these men and their relationship to each other in point of time we have already seen. Still, we must believe that some traditions which reflected the true relations survived, even though exact information was wanting, and thus, although Accius could date Livius Andronicus' first play in 197, it is still probable that he considered him the earliest historical figure in the history of the Roman drama and of Roman literature.<sup>1</sup> But that he should have believed that there was no drama

<sup>1</sup> I say 'probable' advisedly and aware that it is by no means certain; but the point is not essential to my theory of the situation, which in some respects would gain in simplicity if we could show that Accius believed Naevius to be the earlier. It seems to me, however, *a priori* probable that the chronology would have suffered change more easily than the relationship in point of time of the two men to each other, and so the fact of Livius' absolute priority to all others was less likely to be lost than the date of his first play. Furthermore, the passage of Valerius Antias above cited is evidence that the first play of Livius was believed by some to have inaugurated the first *ludi scaenici*, and hence he must have been held to be antecedent to Naevius as a dramatic poet. Evidence of the opposite view might be derived from Cic.

at Rome earlier than this date is quite inconceivable, when we reflect that men still living in Accius' youth would have been able to recall such performances from childhood memories. But Accius was true to his method, though his results must have caused him perplexity. So having fixed on the most distinguished of the Livii as the master of Livius Andronicus, and the capture of Tarentum (209) as the occasion of his falling into the hands of the Romans, Accius carried through his system consistently and fixed the first play of Livius in 197. Accordingly Naevius was also placed much too late, an error which was likewise left for Varro to correct on the authority of Naevius himself (v. *supra*, p. 290). Accius had thus apparently a definite but erroneous conception of the place of Livius in the history of Roman literature. He could give no name in the history of drama earlier than Livius, for tradition had correctly preserved the fact of his priority to all others, and yet there was a period antecedent to 197 during which there must have been oral and perhaps written tradition of the production of plays. (Documentary evidence of them there was also in the aedile's archives, but this source was closed to the ignorance and carelessness of Accius, as to subsequent scholars, until Varro's investigations brought it to light.) The problem, therefore, which confronted Accius was to account satisfactorily for this period, in the absence of documentary evidence and on the basis of report alone. His chronological inquiries had fixed the first play of Livius in 197. He was thus probably prevented from placing Naevius earlier. In consequence a certain period antecedent to 197, concerning which a more or less distinct tradition must have existed, belonged to dramatic history and yet was apparently without record. With Livius Andronicus, further, he knew that the history of the *vía* at Rome began; therefore, if there was a period of dramatic history antecedent to Livius, what was the nature of the comedy of this period? To a Roman philologian moving emulously along the lines laid down by his Greek masters there could be, *κατὰ τὸ εἶκός καὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον*, but one answer—an *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία*, such as the Greek literary historians described,

---

Tusc. I 3: *Livius . . . qui fuit maior natu quam Plautus et Naevius* (where see context). But these words may be referred to a refutation of the notion that Livius was a contemporary of these men, as well as of the opinion that he was younger. That Accius must have thought of all these poets as being nearly contemporary is obvious. Cf. Brutus 72: (*Ennius*), *cui si aequalis fuerit Livius*, etc., and p. 295, note, above.

and before that, the elements out of which it grew. Even if he felt that the law of the Twelve Tables forbidding anything like the personal attack of the old comedy would stand in the way of such an assumption, he had the tradition of Naevius' licence of speech on which to build, and he might also remember that many laws were passed at Athens restricting the freedom of speech in comedy, before the stage of Aristophanes was deserted. I have put the whole situation hypothetically, because from the proximity of Accius to the period in question it cannot well have been otherwise. But here we are not restricted to conjecture on probability of an *a priori* kind. We have the clearest evidence from about the time of Accius that the problem must have presented itself to him in somewhat such a manner as described, and that he must have been confronted with a period of dramatic history for which to account, in the mere fact that the annalistic source of Livy and Verrius Flaccus (Festus, p. 326) placed the first *ludi scaenici* in 365 B. C. (Verrius Flaccus 359 B. C.). Now, a history that assigned the *ludi* to that date was inevitably challenged to outline the history of the drama that was performed at them, down to the point of junction with Livius and recorded history. Working back in this manner the Roman literary historian would naturally assume the same steps leading up to the more highly organized drama as he found in his Greek sources. I say naturally, for the whole history of Roman philological studies reveals exactly such methods of work, and they do not require illustration at this point. There was little need of adaptation of the Greek description to Roman conditions, for there was clearly a most convenient absence of facts to be fitted by any such adapted history.

Thus an account of a drama before Livius was constructed, which is preserved for us in two important versions, that of Livy and that of Horace. It narrated with the same brevity of characterization which belongs to the earliest Greek treatises *περὶ κωμῳδίας* the history of comedy through the successive stages of the *φαλλικά* (*fescennina*), from which comedy took its rise, and of the old comedy, with its open invective (*satura*, *aperta rabies*), down to the point of junction with recorded history as this had been fixed by Accius. This point was made coincident with the transition from the old to the new comedy, and here the description of Livy (VII 2, 8) affords us the name of Livius Andronicus, under whose influence comedy *paulatim in artem verterat*, without further indication of date, while Horace's narrative (Epp. II



1, 156) marks the same stage by the words *Graecia capta . . . intulit artes*, which we have seen are to be referred to the same time as the beginnings of tragedy, viz. *post Punica bella*.

But while in Livy's account the mention of Livius Andronicus is without chronological clue, it affords us a form of expression which is important as confirming the theory of the situation which I have said must have confronted Accius in placing Livius so late. I have said above that the chronology of Accius must of necessity have created a period of dramatic history antecedent to 197, apparently without record, but concerning which a more or less definite tradition must have existed. Now, such a period is distinctly implied in the words *Livius qui ab saturis primus ausus est argumento fabulam serere* (VII 2, 8), for they do not say that Livius was the first to produce plays, but only that he was the first to inaugurate that change in structure of the comic plot which marks the beginning of the more artistic drama, the so-called *vêa*.<sup>1</sup> Now, then, will any one believe that the words just quoted are from the same source as the sharp refutation of Accius' chronological error contained in the vigorous words of Varro: *consulibus Claudio Centhone et M. Sempronio Tuditano* (240 B. C.), *primus omnium L. Livius poeta fabulas docere Romae coepit* (Gellius, XVII 21, 42)? No, surely not. The two statements stand over against each other in marked and distinct antithesis, and are wholly irreconcilable. For while in the one, Livius Andronicus is given an organic place in the development of a native Roman comedy (a view which we have seen was the almost inevitable outcome of a false chronology), in the other he is designated with marked and unmistakable emphasis as the absolute beginner of dramatic performances at Rome. Whether the polemical note contained in the words *primus omnium* is merely directed against the view of Accius in general, or against some special assertion of it, it would be rash to affirm, in view of the meagreness of our sources; but it will at least make my position more clear to show that in fact it reads like a polemic against an utterance such as Livy has here preserved. For while Livy's account says that Livius Andronicus was the first to abandon satires and to compose plays with a general plot, it replies with sharp reproof of the error, that Livius Andronicus was the first of all to produce plays at Rome.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Euanthius (Reif., p. 5): *coacti omittere satyram aliud genus carminis νέαν κωμωδίαν . . . reperere poetae*.

We have now gained a point of view from which it is possible to explain without difficulty practically every problem that the accounts of Livy and Horace present. First of all the remarkable circumstance that Livius should be given a place in the organic development of Roman drama.<sup>1</sup> For placing the beginning of his career so late as Accius did, at a time before which for some forty years plays had been produced, it was the only possible relation that could be assigned to Livius; since it is not only inconceivable that Accius could have said of him that in the year 197 he was the first to produce a play, but the polemic of Varro reveals that he did not say it. Accordingly the tradition of Livius' absolute priority to all other poets Accius probably modified, as is done in Livy's account, so as to make Livius the inaugurator of the new form of comedy, the *néa*, to which all the known comedies of Roman writers belonged. Again, that the description is confined to the origins of comedy may be due to the fact that the dramatic tradition of the period before 197 was dominated by the memory of Naevius' boldness and freedom of speech, and this too, as before suggested, gave a point of analogy for the assumption of a Roman 'old comedy' of unrestrained jest (*solutio ioco*) and open attack (*aperta rabies*).

Our investigation has led us to results of considerable novelty, and they have assumed a definiteness, too, which it would seem impossible to attain on the basis of so meagre a record. But I think I make no arrogant claim in affirming that no step in the argument is without distinct support in our scant sources. That the results are surprising and almost incredible to us who have never considered anything else than the corrected Varronian chronology, will not seem strange; but if we put ourselves back into the extraordinary situation assumed by Accius all is very natural. To resume, therefore: the chronology of Accius, placing the beginning of the dramatic career of Livius Andronicus in 197 B. C., we have found was that probably familiar to Porcius Licinus at the beginning of the first century B. C., it was reproduced by Valerius Antias at about the same time, it was still the current view (though already corrected by Varro, but probably not long before this time) when Cicero wrote the *Brutus* (46 B. C.), the *Tusculan Disputations* (45 or 44) and the *De senectute* (44). It

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Leo, *Hermes*, XXIV (1889), p. 78: "Was hat Andronicus ... mit volksmässigen Rudimenten römischen Bühnenspiels zu thun?"

appears in Livy, writing at about 15 B. C., in such a manner as to indicate that it was still no conspicuous error, and again in Horace's letter to Augustus of about the same date.

Now the first argument for our main contention is found here. The Accian chronology in this passage of Horace is inseparably connected with the preceding description of a native Roman comedy, while this description, as is universally conceded, is derived from the same source as Livy VII 2. That is, Horace's description is a piece of pre-Varronian literary history, and hence the chapter of Livy in question is also pre-Varronian. But this is not all, for in the second place Livy VII 2 bears independent evidence of pre-Varronian origin in the fact that it places Livius Andronicus in organic relation to the history of a comedy developed on Roman soil. Varro, on the contrary, by discovering the true chronological position of Livius and the recorded facts of Roman dramatic history, was able to affirm with great distinctness and emphasis that he had nothing to do with any earlier dramatic performances, that, indeed, there had never been a drama at Rome (*primus omnium*) before Livius Andronicus.

Thus with the downfall of the chronology of Accius, the whole structure of artificial literary history to which it had given rise fell. In consequence, in all subsequent allusions to the beginnings of Roman literature we find the scantiest trace of this pre-Varronian fiction, in spite of the fact that it carried the prestige of two such names as Livy and Horace. Livy himself had learned better (though he perhaps forgot it again in book thirty-six) when the progress of his narrative had brought him to the year 239, if it be true that Cassiodorus derived from Livy XX the following statement in his *Chronica* against that year: *his consularibus* (C. Manlius and Q. Valerius) *ludis Romanis primum tragoedia et comoedia a L. Livio ad scaenam data*. One other mention of the same fact will be instructive as showing the gulf that lay between the assumed knowledge which the descriptions of Livy and Horace reveal, and Varro's well-founded ignorance of any dramatic history prior to Livius Andronicus: *comoediam apud Graecos dubium est quis primus invenerit, apud Romanos certum: et comoediam et tragoediam [et togatam] primus Livius Andronicus repperit* (Donatus de comoedia, Reif., p. 8). But it is not necessary to review the frequent references subsequent to Livy's time to the corrected chronology of Varro. It will suffice to say that, with the exception of Valerius Maximus (II 4, 4),

who epitomized Livy's chapter without intelligence, of Euanthius (De com., p. 5, Reif.), who had from some good source a confused knowledge of the pre-Livian dramatic history, and a scholium of Porphyrio on the passage of Horace in question,<sup>1</sup> all record of it was swept away by Varro's investigations.<sup>2</sup>

We have thus seen that the two accounts which present us with the fiction of a Roman drama before Livius either reveal the chronology of Accius or else show distinct incompatibility with Varro's correction of it and with his statement of the position of Livius Andronicus in Roman dramatic history. It is therefore most natural and indeed almost necessary, as has been implied already, to refer the construction of this fictitious history to the same source as the false chronology which made it necessary. That is, to Accius; and I see nothing which stands in the way of such an assumption; nor is there, on the other hand, any figure in the pre-Varronian period to whom it can be referred with equal probability, nor any source from which it would more naturally have come than the Libri didascalicon; a brief consideration of which will afford an appropriate transition to the question of the Greek source which mediated between Aristotle and the one who first carried over the Aristotelian outline of the history of Greek comedy, as revealed in the descriptions of Livy and Horace.

To our knowledge of the Didascalica the investigations of the past few years have added a number of important items, so that the general character of the work (and of the related Pragmatica)

<sup>1</sup>For Euanthius, see my article above referred to, A. J. P. XV (1894), p. 13, and for Porphyrio, *ibid.*, p. 21. That Porphyrio has not stupidly attached a Greek explanation to the words of Horace, but understood them of a Roman *archaea comoedia*, is clear from his note on vs. 161, immediately afterward: *serus enim*] ratio cur Romanus non expoliverit pristina rudimenta.

<sup>2</sup>Our primary evidence for the history of satire (Diomedes, p. 485, with which Quintilian, X 1, 93 is in singular harmony) has not a word concerning a dramatic *satura* before Ennius, nor is the silence on this point due to the caprice of the epitomator, but to the deliberate rejection of a pre-Livian dramatic history such as Livy and Horace present. For in the same treatise De poematibus we have at p. 489 the emphatic statement of Varro's results: *constat apud illos (sc. Romanos) primum Latino sermone comoediam Livium Andronicum scripsisse*. How therefore, in the definition and sketch of satire, could we expect to find allusion made to a drama before Livius? The acceptance of Varro's results concerning the time and the position of Livius Andronicus was ipso facto rejection of any account which placed him in organic relation to a native Roman comedy.

is now discerned not obscurely.<sup>1</sup> The title was not interpreted narrowly by Accius, nor was the work confined within the limits which the analogy of Aristotle's *Διδασκαλῖαι* would suggest. The argument of the work was somewhat as follows. It began, I venture to believe, with a consideration of the different branches of poetry and their distinguishing characteristics, in regard to which a fragment assigned (as I suspect falsely) to the ninth book is preserved, containing also the dedication to Baebius: *nam quam varia sint genera poematorum, Baebi, quamque longe distincta alia ab aliis, sis, nosce*<sup>2</sup> (fr. 15, Baehrens). From this, transition was made to the epos and to Homer and Hesiod as the fountain-head of all poetry, so that the determination of their relative age may be thought of as having some historical (and not merely antiquarian) significance for the author's purpose, as fixing the ultimate source from which all forms of poetry were derived (fr. 7). But as the title indicates, the work was not a general survey of poetry and its forms (as Norden affirms), but a history of the drama and the stage, and the matter thus far reviewed was introductory to the special subject, of which there is unmistakable evidence of treatment in the first book (fr. 8).<sup>3</sup> From the third book to the eighth there are no citations with designation of their place, but it is quite certain that after a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. especially Marx in Pauly's Realencyc., ed. II, article Accius; Norden, Varronianae, Rh. Mus., vol. 48 (1893), p. 529 ff., where the significance of the title *Pragmatica* is explained (p. 531); Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 32 (note).

<sup>2</sup> Charisius, p. 141, 34. The fragment is cited by Charisius with the formula *Accius quoque didascaliorum* VIII. I should guess that the error arose from a dittography of the three final characters of original *didascaliorum* I, in which *vm* I was read a second time as VIII.

All analogies as well as ordinary expectation would assign this fragment to the beginning of the treatise. Cf., for example, Tzetzes' *περὶ διαφορᾶς ποιητῶν* (Dübner, X b, p. xxiii), vs. 1 ff.: *ποιητικῶν μέλλονσιν ἀρχεσθαι λόγων* || *χρεὸν δίδασκεν πρῶτα τὰς διαιρέσεις*—words which indicate the practice as well as the principle of the arrangement of such treatises. That Tzetzes follows a tradition that dates from a period as early as the second century B. C. is shown by the exact agreement of the words which follow with our fragment of Accius: *ποιητικὸν (poematorum) γίνωσκε (nosce) σὺ (Baebi) γένος (genera) νέε* || *πόλλας τόμας φέρον (quam varia sint) τε καὶ διαιρέσεις (quamque longe distincta alia ab aliis)*. For the prefacing of a special treatise on dramatic poetry with an enumeration of the *genera poematorum*, cf. the Coislinian treatise *περὶ κομωδίας* (Dübner, X d; Vahlen, *Arist. Poetics*, p. 79), which begins with a complete classification of poetry (vid. *infra*, p. 308).

<sup>3</sup> I call attention to this because both Marx and Norden look upon the first book as devoted to epic poetry.

consideration of Greek dramatic poetry, to which the fragments of the second book refer, transition was made to Roman dramatic poetry, and to this part we must assign the chronological error in regard to the time of the first play of Livius (fr. 19), the discussion of the plays of Plautus *quae dicuntur ambiguae* (Gell. III 3, 1, fr. 20), and the allusion to the production of plays by Accius and Pacuvius in the same year, *cum ille octoginta, ipse triginta annos natus esset* (Brutus 229, fr. 21). The history of drama was followed by one or more books *de apparatu scaenico*, the single fragment from the eighth referring to the dress and equipment of actors. The ninth book may have continued the same subject, since, as I have said above, it is scarcely credible that at the end of the work the subject of the *genera poematorum* should have been taken up instead of at the beginning. Whether the orthographical principles of Accius were included in this work or not is uncertain; it is at least not impossible (cf. Norden, l. c., p. 536, note 3). In regard to the form of the work it is the opinion of Leo and Marx, following the observations of Bücheler (Rh. Mus., vol. 35, p. 401), that it was the Menippean combination of prose and verse, and the evidence, though slight, seems to warrant this conclusion. The date is uncertain. "Severioris doctrinae libros provectiore aetate composuisse Accium probabile est," says Müller (Lucil., p. 318), and Marx is able to fix the publication of the orthographical views of Accius at about 115 B. C., to which period he would also assign his other grammatical work (l. c., column 147 ad fin.).

The question of source is for our purpose more important. It is discussed briefly by Norden (l. c., p. 537), who says "pleraque fragmenta quasi digito ostendunt Aristophanem Byzantium," and he assumes that this is the general opinion of scholars. But he adduces no argument that goes beyond the assumption that there is no more probable source, *unde omnia perdisce ac percipi queuntur* (fr. 18),—a fragment in which Norden goes so far as to believe that Aristophanes is actually alluded to. But that is carrying speculation beyond legitimate limits in a manner that is by no means characteristic of the remainder of Norden's acute investigation. Marx is probably nearer the truth in stating that Accius was still chiefly under the influence of the Pergamene studies introduced by Crates, and he cites one positive bit of evidence of it that outweighs all of Norden's assumptions of probability. The miserable arguments by which Accius demon-

strated the seniority of Hesiod to Homer, I have quoted above (p. 286) in illustration of the trivial character of early Roman philological studies. That the opposite view was held by Aristarchus is pointed out by Marx, citing Aristonicus ad Il. XII 22, who gives reasons for the priority of Homer to Hesiod which are worthy to stand by the side of Accius' grounds for the opposite view, and which reveal that Accius probably derived not only his position in the question but also the arguments themselves from a Pergamene source. *À propos* of the mention of the rivers *ῥοοὶ ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἄλαθε προρέουσι* (Il. XII 19), the commentator writes: *ὅτι ἀνέγνω Ἡσίοδος τὰ Ὀμήρου ὡς ἂν νεώτερος τούτου· οὐ γὰρ ἐξεγήνοχε τοὺς ποταμοὺς μὴ ὄντας ἀξιολόγους, εἰ μὴ δι' Ὀμηρον, καὶ τῷ Σιμοῦντι προσέθηκεν ἐπίθετον τὸ θεῖόν τε Σιμοῦντα* (= Theogony 342; Lehrs, Aristarchus, p. 232 of the original edition). Leo, furthermore, recognizes in the fragment concerning the genuineness of certain Plautine plays the "sprachlich ästhetische Kritik, die nach pergamenischen Vorbild zu handhaben den römischen Dilettanten lockender erschien" (Plaut. Forsch., p. 33), and which was not combined with historical and chronological investigations of the Alexandrine type until Varro turned his attention to these studies.

To come at length to the question of the Greek source which afforded the Aristotelian outline of the history of comedy revealed in the descriptions of Livy and Horace, it may be assumed without further discussion that the Poetics of Aristotle was not used directly,<sup>1</sup> and we should naturally look for some more conventionalized Pergamene or Alexandrine source. In this matter I have said before that the twofold division of Attic comedy which both accounts display affords some clue, if Kaibel be right in identifying this division as Pergamene in distinction from the threefold Alexandrine classification. The circumstance that Accius is probably to be looked upon as a representative of the Pergamene school, as above pointed out, would cause us to look for a source in this direction, and there is no one to whom we should more naturally turn than to the master himself, Crates.

Our knowledge of the nature and the history of Greek comedy, aside from the material afforded by the monuments themselves, the brief testimony of Aristotle, and occasional allusions of other

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Heitz, *Verlorene Schriften des Arist.*, p. 90, though of course I do not share his view concerning the fate of the esoteric writings. Cf. Zeller, *Phil. d. Gr.* II 2, p. 139 ff.

ancient writers, depends upon a series of treatises (for the most part anonymous) *περὶ κωμωδίας*, which are most fully collected in Dübner's Scholia in Aristophanem. Other treatises of a similar character are enumerated by Consbruch,<sup>1</sup> who has been almost the only one to essay seriously the task of distinguishing the different elements and periods of grammatical studies which they contain. Several of these documents give as the source of their most valuable information Dionysius, Crates, Eucleides (Düb., pp. xix, 96), usually named together, so that we have but little assistance in separating the property of each. The identification of these names and the allotment of the different parts of the material adduced on their authority is naturally a matter of extreme difficulty and complexity. Consbruch has attempted it in a most painstaking study to which I have just alluded. His argument is far too technical and extensive to be even summarized here; but following it step by step, his conclusions have seemed to me sound and to merit the recognition which they have received.<sup>2</sup> He reaches the conclusion that of the three names above cited, Eucleides is the compiler of Dionysius and Crates and not an independent source. On the identity of the Dionysius in question, v. Consbruch, p. 225. In regard to Crates there has been general agreement that the Pergamene master is meant. To him, Consbruch concludes, must be assigned the divisions of comedy into its parts (in Tzetzae prolegomena in Aristoph. (Ritschl, Op.), p. 204 = Proleg. of the cod. Venetus of Aristophanes, Dübner, p. xxviii, note), and this in turn not only in respect to the division of comedy, but also in the division of *τὸ γελοῖον* (cf. Dübner, No. VI, p. xvi), is in complete agreement with the division in the valuable treatise e cod. Coisliniano, except that the latter is fuller on both subjects. He raises the question, therefore, whether this Coislinian treatise, in which, as Bernays has so shown convincingly, are contained important remains of Aristotelian teachings concerning comedy,<sup>3</sup> is not to be ascribed to Crates, though not, of course, immediately. In addition to the points of identity with the portions of other treatises *περὶ κωμωδίας* which must be assigned to Crates, this

<sup>1</sup> Zu den Tractaten *περὶ κωμωδίας* in Comm. in honorem Guil. Studemund, Strassburg, 1889, p. 213 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Susemihl, Gesch. d. gr. Lit., vol. II, p. 11 (note 54).

<sup>3</sup> Ergänzung zu Aristoteles Poetik. Originally in Rh. Mus., vol. VIII (1853), p. 561, now the second of Zwei Abhandlungen über die Aristotelische Theorie des Drama. Berlin, 1880.



treatise, as Consbruch observes, presents a number of features that either indicate Pergamene origin or at least marked divergence from the current Alexandrine sources of later antiquity. So, for instance, the division of poetry into *ποίησις ἀμίμητος* and *μιμητή* is radically at variance not only with Aristotle, but with Theophrastus and the general habit of later antiquity, fixed by the Alexandrine school, and yet it is on the whole so sensible and so obviously directed toward giving theoretical justification to didactic poetry like that of Empedocles, that we cannot imagine it an innovation of late date. This is, to be sure, but a negative indication of Pergamene origin, to which Consbruch adds one or two others, so that his suggestion that the Coislinian treatise represents a fuller form of the matter which in the others must be assigned to Crates gains in probability. But though differing from Aristotle in the general divisions of poetry, the treatise clearly represents throughout the Aristotelian theory of comedy with singular fidelity, and in marked contrast to other treatises of a like nature derived from stereotyped Alexandrine sources.

The closeness of adherence to Aristotle in the descriptions of Livy and Horace has already been alluded to, and I shall here repeat only two of the most striking points which illustrate a general principle of Aristotelian theory, viz. the condemnation of the old comedy of personal satire and the recognition of the superior art of the universal argument of the new comedy. In Poetics VI 3 but one name is mentioned in the history of old comedy, and that because it marked the transition to the new: *Κράτης πρῶτος ἦρξεν ἀφένεος τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους*, of which *Livius primus ab saturis ausus est argumento fabulam serere* is practically a verbatim translation.<sup>1</sup> Similarly in Horace (Epp. II 1, 155), in the words *vertere modum—ad benedicendum delectandumque*, we have reproduced the Aristotelian deliberative definition of jest in comedy: *ὀριστείον τῷ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα ἢ καὶ τέρπειν*; (Eth. IV 14, 7). It is contaminated here, however, with the conventional Alexandrine account of the cessation of the *ἀρχαία κωμ.* by reason of the laws forbidding the *ὀνομαστὶ κωμῶδειν* (*formidine fustis . . . redacti*, *ibid.*). The Aristotelian point of view is for the most part alien to the treatises

<sup>1</sup> On *satura* = *ἰαμβικὴ ἰδέα*, *argumento fabulam serere* = *καθόλου ποιεῖν μύθους*, v. 'Dramatic Satura,' etc., pp. 10-12 and notes. For the following cf. *ibid.*, pp. 24 and 25.

περὶ κωμωδίας; which being derived from a school that esteemed the ἀρχαία as greatly as the νέα and which recognized its lasting significance and vitality, do not imply that it is an inferior form of art. In this respect the Coislinian treatise is in marked contrast to the others and, as was to be expected from its Aristotelian character, it contains the same censure of the old comedy that we have found in Aristotle. Thus in §4 (Bernays = Vahlen, p. 79) the distinction between the old and the new comedy is drawn with a partisan sharpness that reveals the hand of Aristotle (v. infra, p. 310). To the same tendency belong the words descriptive of the old and the new comedy at the end of the whole treatise: τῆς κωμωδίας παλαιά, ἢ πλεονάζουσα τῷ γελοίῳ.<sup>1</sup> νέα, ἢ τοῦτο μὲν προειμένη, πρὸς δὲ τὸ σεμνὸν ῥέπουσα. The very close resemblance of this, not only in thought but also in expression, to the words of Livy's account in VII 2, 11 which characterize the *satura* and marked the transition to the more artistic drama of Livius [*ab risu ac soluto ioco* (πλεονάζουσα τῷ γελοίῳ) *res avocabatur* (τοῦτο μὲν προειμένη) *et ludus in artem* (πρὸς δὲ τὸ σεμνὸν) *paulatim verterat* (ῥέπουσα)], might not be urged too strongly as evidence of anything more than the same point of view, if it were not for the fact that in this same chapter we have a most unmistakable adaptation from the Poetics in the allusion to Livius Andronicus, and a similar reproduction of Aristotelian theory in Horace. We are therefore justified, I think, in suspecting that the *form* of Livy's description is derived from the same source as the schematic words of the Coislinian treatise. That the *thought* is Aristotelian does not require proof. Our identification of this portion of the Latin description as Aristotelian by comparison with a treatise of Pergamene origin suggests inevitably that the Aristotelian elements in Livy's and Horace's descriptions are derived from their ultimate source through a Pergamene medium—a conclusion which is in accord with what has been noted above concerning the probable source of the Didascalica of Accius.

There remains still one point to consider, and that is the designation of the assumed ἀρχαία κωμωδία as *satura*. I have

<sup>1</sup> By these words is designated the abundance of the simple elements of physical laughter such as the λοιδορία and αἰσχρολογία of the old comedy would provoke. It is the *risu diducere rictum auditoris* of Horace, and for Aristotle as well as Horace this was not enough. A συμμετρία . . . τοῦ γελοίου ἐν ταῖς κωμωδίαις (π. κωμ. Coisl., §6) was necessary:—"Wie in der Tragödie ein Ebenmass von φόβος zu ἔλεος verlangt wurde, so muss die Komödie ein Ebenmass von γέλως zu τέρψις haben" (Bernays, p. 151).

shown before that the well-known parallelism assumed by Roman critics between Lucilius and the old comedy (Horace, *Serm.* I 4) illustrates the possibility and the applicability of this designation, and perhaps it is a sufficient explanation to say that in the interest of clearness it was desirable to choose a designation which should be descriptive, rather than such a term as *vetus* or *antiqua comoedia*, which would have been subject to misinterpretation as referring only to a time distinction. But the true reason probably lay deeper and is to be looked for in the Greek source from which the description is drawn. It is doubtless well known that in the *Poetics* Aristotle distinctly disavows for the drama of Cratinus, Eupolis and Aristophanes the designation of *κωμωδία* in an ideal sense—I mean in such a manner as *τραγῳδία* is used by him for the drama of Aeschylus and Sophocles. So, for example, those writers are excluded from the domain of true comedy in the words *τὰ τῆς κωμωδίας σχήματα πρῶτος* (*Ὅμηρος*) *ὑπέδειξεν, οὐ ψόγον ἀλλὰ τὸ γελοῖον δραματοποιήσας* (IV 9). Again, in outlining the development of comedy he alludes to the *ἀρχαία* as the *λαμβικὴ ἰδέα*, the lampooning form of comedy—that is, the lampooning stage in the slow development of real comedy—which even in his own time he did not look upon as having attained its perfect form like tragedy, “which after passing through many changes stopped when it had arrived at its true nature” (IV 12). It is, perhaps, therefore not an accident of our meagre record that has withheld from us a definition of comedy from the hand of Aristotle; for while he was prepared to indicate the course that true comedy must take and was taking, he was not prepared to define it in its imperfect form. Most instructive, from this point of view, is the illustration of the universal in poetry in IX 5: “In comedy this is now apparent; for the poets put together their plots from the standpoint of probability and assume any names for their characters whatsoever, and not as the lampooners (*λαμποποιοί*) who write concerning a particular person.” Now, in the *Coislinian* treatise *περὶ κωμωδίας* the same point of view is given utterance to with even greater emphasis than in the *Poetics*, and there we find true comedy set over against the abusiveness that had formerly passed for comedy in a striking manner (§4, Bernays): *Διαφέρει ἡ κωμωδία* (i. e. true comedy) *τῆς λοιδορίας* (i. e. the *ἀρχαία κωμ.*), while the same point of view is revealed in the division of comedy into periods at the end of the whole treatise (v. *supra*, p. 309).

Looked at in this light, we shall be justified in suspecting that it is not a mere accident, that in the account of Livy the period

corresponding to the old comedy is marked by the descriptive designation *satura* and not by the word *comoedia*. The literary historian, following the Aristotelian model, avoided the latter word and chose an expression that should characterize it unmistakably as λουδορία, *maledicentia*, and found for this no more fitting Latin word than *satura*, the native Roman type of the *carmen maledicum* (Diomedes, from an early source). And just as Aristotle designates the writers of the old comedy as λαμβοποιοί, so we find Lucilius placed in the same category in Diomedes, p. 485 (Suetonius, Reif., p. 19): *iambus est carmen maledicum . . . appellatum . . . παρὰ τὸ λαμβίζειν, quod est maledicere* (cf. Proclus ap. Reif., l. c., τὸ λαμβίζειν κατὰ τινα γλῶσσαν λουδορεῖν ἔλεγον): *cuius carminis praeceptui scriptores . . . apud Romanos Lucilius et Catullus* etc.<sup>1</sup> We need not therefore assume that the theory of Lucilius as the Roman representative of the old comedy had already been developed: it was sufficient that his poems should have been recognized as a typical form of λουδορία. And who had better reason to realize this than Accius, (*cuius*) *in poematis obtrectandis clarior Lucilius fuit* (Gell. XVII 21, 49)?

In conclusion, to bring together in brief summary the lines of the foregoing argument, I have aimed to prove first of all that the chapter of Roman literary history under discussion is pre-Varronian, and is to be attributed most naturally to Accius. In what has been presented concerning the Greek source which mediated between Aristotle and Accius, I have desired to indicate the most probable line of connection, in a case where certainty is unattainable. The remarks on the appropriateness of giving to an assumed 'old comedy' a descriptive designation such as the name *satura* affords will, I hope, carry conviction, and serve to confirm the correctness of the view which I have advanced by furnishing another element of close analogy to Aristotelian theory.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

<sup>1</sup> The fact that Lucilius is reckoned among the Roman iambic writers as well as among the satirists may perhaps indicate two sources or periods of literary criticism. The association of his name with the writers of the old comedy is certainly as old as Varro or, as I suspect, older. An earlier view may not have gone further than to make him an *ιαμβοποιός*, rather from tone and spirit than as an author of iambic verses, which, to be sure, he wrote. Might the transference of the name of his composition to an assumed Roman ἀρχαία κωμ. have given rise to the notion of his dependence on the old comedy?